

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to the restriction requirement included in the office action dated May 19th, 2004.

On page 2 of the office action, it was stated the application contains claims directed to 5 species. The office action further identified Claim 1 as generic.

The above characterization was not correct in that the original claims including Claim 1 were canceled in favor of a preliminary Amendment dated July 31st, 2003 which inserted claims 27 to 30.


Applicant's attorney contacted the Examiner, as he believed the preliminary amendment might have become disassociated from the application. During a phone conversation it was decided applicant should respond to the restriction requirement as though it were directed against claims 27-30.

In view of the above applicant chooses to prosecute claims 29 and 30 as presented in the preliminary Amendment as well as newly added claims 31 through 33, which depend from claim 29 and/or 30.

In view of the above applicant believes he has made a complete response to the office action.

In view of the aforementioned, it is respectfully urged that the present application be reconsidered, the claims allowed, and the case passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,


Markell Seitzman
Reg. No. 28,756

(586) 726-3905
(586) 726-4172 (fax)